



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

81

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/971,960 11/17/97 STILZ

H 026083/0138

HM12/0419

EXAMINER

FOLEY & LARDNER  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET N W  
P O BOX 25696  
WASHINGTON DC 20007

DAZI,S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

20

DATE MAILED:

04/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Office Action Summary**Application No.  
08/971,960

Applicant(s)

Stilz et al.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Group Art Unit

1616

 Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 18, 2000 This action is **FINAL**. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

**Disposition of Claims** Claim(s) 21-24 and 39-103 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

 Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. Claim(s) 21-24 and 39-103 is/are rejected. Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to. Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.**Application Papers** See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner. The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved. The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119** Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_. received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).**Attachment(s)** Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152**--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---**

Art Unit: 1616

**First Office Action on Merits**

**Status of the application**

Claims 21-24 and 39-103 are pending.

Claims 21-24 and 39-103 are rejected.

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's response in paper no. 19, dated 2/18/2000 with election of group II and species of compound 53 is hereby acknowledged. Applicant is requested to show the support of the methods as claimed in the specification.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-24 and 39-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zoller et al (US Patent 5,424,293). See formula (I) in col. 1, where Y is -(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>m</sub>-CO-, Z is O, W is

Art Unit: 1616

in US'293. Zoller et al. disclose that imidazoline derivatives of formula I have the ability to inhibit cell-cell adhesion. Furthermore, it teaches that these compounds additionally inhibit the binding of the other adhesive proteins, such as vitronectin, collagen and laminin to the corresponding receptors on the surface of various types of cell. See lines 21-37, col. 12.

The instant claims differ from the reference by reciting specific species and/or a more limited subgenus than the reference.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference to prepare additional beneficial preparations and method of use because such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole.

Art Unit: 1616

It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

There has been ample motivation provided by the prior art to prepare the instant invention particularly when the method of use has been taught by the prior art.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. In re opprecht 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); In re Bode 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1976).

A reference is not limited to working examples. In re Fracalossi 215 USPQ 569 (CCPA 1982).

Accordingly, the burden of proof is upon applicants to show that instantly claimed subject matter is different and unobvious over those taught by prior art. See In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685, 688; In re Best, 195 USPQ 430 and In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289, 293.

Art Unit: 1616

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The data showing any unexpected results would overcome the above 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

**Telephonic Inquiry**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha N. Qazi, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.



Sabiha N. Qazi Ph.D.

4/10/2000

**Examiner, AU 1616**